

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1-5 and 8-12 and support for the amendments is found on page 4, line 4 through page 5, line 12. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lammi et al (WO 01/28273). The Applicant has amended claims 1-3 and 8-10 to more clearly define the intended scope of the claimed invention and distinguish the present invention from Lammi. In addition, claims 6 and 13 have been canceled. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant discloses a system and method for protecting the identity of subscribers, both the identity of the requesting subscriber and the identity of the target subscriber. A Subscriber Identity Server (SIS) is utilized to provide aliases to both the requester and the target. Both aliases may be used when determining the location.

Lammi discloses a method and system for protecting the user identifier from a service provider (page 4, lines 11-22).

The Applicant's invention protects the identity of the requesting subscriber who is trying to determine the location of a target subscriber. Lammi merely discloses protecting the identity of a user of a service. Lammi protects a subscriber from a content provider while the Applicant protects the identity/integrity of a requesting subscriber seeking the location of a target subscriber and the identity of the target subscriber.

Lammi lacks at least the limitation of protecting the identity of both the requesting subscriber and the target subscriber as there is no target subscriber disclosed in Lammi. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Withdrawal of the rejection of analogous claim 8, which contains similar limitations, and the respective depending claims 3, and 9-10 is also requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 4 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al (WO 01/28273) in view of Olrik et al (US publication number: 2003/0125042). The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to more clearly define the intended scope of the claimed invention and distinguish the present invention from Lammi and Olrik. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Olrik is cited for disclosing a positioning request as an SMS message. However, Olrik does not make up the limitations missing in Lammi; that of one subscriber requesting the location of another subscriber and the method and system of the Applicant's invention providing an alias for each subscriber. Claim 4 depends from amended claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 11 depends from amended claim 8 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 8. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4 and 11.

Claims 5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al (WO 01/28273) in view of Baba et al (patent number: JPO2003078632). The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to more clearly define the intended scope of the claimed invention and distinguish the present invention from Lammi and Baba. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Baba is cited for disclosing a positioning request as a voice call via a call center (IVR). Baba fails to disclose the limitations missing from Lammi and the combination of Lammi and Baba fails to disclose the limitations of Applicant's claims 1 and 8 from which claims 5 and 12 depend. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 12.

Claims 7 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al (WO 01/28273) in view of Kim et al (US publication number: 2002/0083198). The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to more clearly define the intended scope of the claimed invention and distinguish the present invention from Lammi and Kim. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Kim is cited for disclosing an alias identity as an E.164 number. However, Kim fails to provide the limitation of providing an alias to two subscribers; the limitation lacking in Lammi. Claim 7 depends from amended claim 1 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 14 depends from amended claim 8 and recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 8. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 14.

Prior Art Not Relied Upon

In paragraph 12 on page 13 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com